JW: Don't copy the Newsweek piece on CIA assets and proprietaries for me. I'm getting one, thanks.

I also have the LATimes Slawson-Mosk uncontrolled conscience. (This is the same Slawson who told the NYTimes there should be a new investigation when he was embarrassed over the Jones Harris partial leak of the Russia/imposter bit.)

I'll welcome copies of any coverage of the AP Sunday story, the real purpose being not only to have a record of coverage but to leave a comparison with the non-covering major papers the Congress sees. All three.

I heard today that it was the Cleve Plain Dealer's threeOcolumn page-one lead story and similar treatment in Columbus, O.

No net handled but individual r and tv seem to have, extensively.

As of today USNWR is going four pages. The original words was a Newsweek copy. I'm hoping it won't be an ax job. The art director talks as though it isn't.

Sherf, in checking something for the LA Times, indicated Rothberg follow-up for AP but I've heard nothing and he is on the domestic-spying story.

I found the fairly long and pointedly critical letter criticizing the Post for its assassination coverage interesting. Maybe no more than Geyelin's subtle way of continuing the Bradlee battle and round-about CIA defense but nonetheless a clear departure.

A USIA reporter phoned to say he could get no answer from the Post's national desk on why the story wasn't carried. The daily staff claimed no knowledge of who on Sunday made the negative decision. Someone unknown at State Dept also though bad journalism, overt suppression.

But otherwise very little reaction to me. Onebuff of past phoned only.

Both Washington employees caught on second-day p.m. use of WxStar's radio station.

One other odditiy: this time no single radio station phoned to ask me to b'cast on it. Not even Eason, who is on or has had his today's show.

I guess JL did not hear anything from the government's lawyers or is busy doing something about it because it is 4:10 p.m. and no word about any response to our interrgoatories with the session for 9:30 a.m. I'll get to his place early with a short memo of fact and recalcitrance/withholding/ lying for him to use if he likes.

I've got the pix is we decide to use in or out of court. Haven't had a chance to make my own enlargements yet and may not need. Have negatives, too.

I like the government up tight like this. Maybe the judge will not. But it gives me a clear reading on their apprehension if they run risks like these, of antagonizing a judge.

If the press is there, which would be novel but not without precedent, and if it is interested, which would be without precedent, I've enough now regardless of what they do tomorrow.

Or, I'm not a bit impatient. Only worried about what the nuts will do next.

(As you may have observed, the stream of Rockefeller Commission leaks to condition the press and public mind have begun. All rehashes of the well-known but to make it appear that it is doing a real job.)

I must be getting along well. I've had three bouts at mowing today and plan another despite the 80+ temperature. I'm cooling off now. Sticky day. I'm pacing it and don't feel it more than I used to those twice or more as long in the past.

After court tomorrow I'm to meet with staffers for Downey of Virginia (resolution on JFK only introduced) and Hughes of N.J.-huy who beat Sandman. They've asked for a position paper. Had to be off the top again. Lil is retyping. I've been forthright on problems but after this it is upbeat on possobilities....Lane appears to be raking it in on the lecture circuit again from what I hear....I'll be sending about 3 ozs 3 cl soon, before I mail this probably, Copies of other things.

Best,

MW 5/20/75